REMARKS

The claims have been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

The applicant reiterate the arguments set forth in a REPLY dated February 16, 2005. However, in view of a discussion with the Examiner on April 13, 2005, at the USPTO, the applicant's attorney has agreed to cancel all claims drawn to compositions and articles of manufacture, without prejudice, to advance prosecution of the remaining method claims, i.e. claims 21-25 and 27. The method claims have also been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-6 and 14-27 for obviousness under 35 USC 103 over Gluchowski and Bishop. As discussed by the applicant's attorney and in the REPLY, the references do not disclose the treatment of optic nerve and retinal ganglion cells, as now amended; therefore the applicant believes this rejection is now moot. The Examiner is asked to reconsider and withdraw her rejection.

Please use our Deposit Account 01-0885 for extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/21/05	By: Robert Baran
	Registration No. 25,806
	Attorney of Record
	ALLERGAN, INC T2-7H
	2525 Dupont Drive
	Irvine, CA 92612
	Telephone: (714) 246-4669
	Fax: (714) 246-4249
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENC POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL ADDRES COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Ale	

Printed name of Person Making Deposit: Bonnie Ferguson

Signature of Person Making Deposit_